



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,558	11/03/2000	Yasuhito Taira	001475	4557

38834 7590 02/24/2004

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

401.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/704,558

Applicant(s)

TAIRA, YASUHIITO

Examiner

James H Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
2. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siow et al. (hereinafter Siow, U.S. Patent No. 6,301,590) in view of Hill et al. (hereinafter Hill, U.S. Patent No. 6,023,714).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Siow teaches a user using Web browser 100 may still access static HTML documents from Web server 105 and data repository 110. In this scenario, however, scripts 115 are used to support dynamic HTML publishing, i.e. HTML documents are created "on the fly" in response to user requests. Scripts 115 include Common Gateway Interface (CGI) scripts, Netscape Server Application

Interface (NSAPI) scripts and Microsoft's Internet Server API (ISAPI) scripts. Each of these is described in further detail below. CGI scripts provided the early means for dynamic Web page generation. CGI programs or scripts that run on Web servers are typically written in an interpretative language like Perl or shell scripts. These languages are popular because they are easy to debug and manage. CGI can, however, also call existing programs written in a compiled language such as C or C++ (Col. 1, lines 59-67; Col. 2, lines 1-10; Fig. 1B; compare to Claim 1, **"A processor connected via a network system to an operation terminal unit in which inputs are made through a web browser and having at least a Web server division, a CGI script control division and a processing program division, ..."**). Siow does not specifically teach a *display control file describing therein display control information for a Web page that is displayed on said operation terminal unit, wherein said CGI script division analyzes the description on said display control file which is designated by said Web browser, executes for processing said processing program following said description of said display control file and outputs display control information on said display control file to said Web browser based on the result of said processing.* However, Hill teaches an exemplary system for dynamically adapting the layout of a document to a display device may include a client, a server, a document, a layout generator and multiple style sheets. The client and the server are typically connected via a network. The document specifies the content of the document as well as the structure of the document. Typically, the document is an HTML document that includes embedded tags to define the structural elements of the document. The layout generator may be executed by either the client or

the server. If the layout generator is executed on the client, then the client interrogates the display device and selects a style sheet. If the layout generator is executed on the server, then the server interrogates the display device and selects a style sheet. The display device is interrogated to determine the capabilities of the output device (Col. 2, lines 25-39; compare to Claim 1, ***“a display control file describing therein display control information for a Web page that is displayed on said operation terminal unit, wherein said CGI script division analyzes the description on said display control file which is designated by said Web browser, executes for processing said processing program following said description of said display control file and outputs display control information on said display control file to said Web browser based on the result of said processing”***). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have combined the teachings of Siow and Hill providing the benefit of having customized the layout of a web document having depended on the display device of the client.

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Siow fails to teach in said display control file, said display control information is described separately in a file control division and an HTML division. However, Hill teaches that a server receives a document request from the client. In response to the document request, the server retrieves the document and the layout generator. The layout generator interrogates the display device attached to the client to determine the capabilities of the output device. Based upon the capabilities of the output device, the layout generator selects one of the style sheets. The server sends the document and the selected style sheet to the client and the client renders the

document on the output device using the selected style sheet (Col. 2, lines 30-39; compare to Claim 2, “... **in said display control file, said display control information is described separately in a file control division and an HTML division**”. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have combined the teachings of Siow and Hill providing the benefit of having separated the HTML content from the formatting control file (spreadsheet) in the web environment.

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Siow fails to teach that *said CGI script control division reads said display control information for each line and executes an analyzing process*. However, Hill teaches a style generator which dynamically generates style definitions and a style sheet rather than selecting a style sheet from a plurality of style sheets. The style generator is typically included in the layout generator. Each style definition defines a format value for a format property of an element of the document. The style generator creates a style sheet by creating style definitions appropriate for the capabilities of the display device. (Col. 2, lines 56-65; compare to Claim 3, “... **said CGI script control division reads said display control information for each line and executes an analyzing process**”. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have combined the teachings of Siow and Hill providing the benefit of having created a stylesheet to have properly configured a web page to a specific display device.

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Siow fails to teach *said CGI script control division embeds in an HTML output dynamic information related to the display of said*

Web page following the description in said HTML division and outputs the HTML output to said Web server division. However, Hill teaches that the layout generator may be executed by the server in the server-controlled embodiment. In the server-controlled embodiment, the server receives a document request from the client. In response to the document request, the server retrieves the document and the layout generator. The layout generator interrogates the display device attached to the client to determine the capabilities of the output device. Based upon the capabilities of the output device, the layout generator selects one of the style sheets. The server sends the document and the selected style sheet to the client and the client renders the document on the output device using the selected style sheet (Col. 3, lines 9-20; compare to Claim 4, “... ***said CGI script control division embeds in an HTML output dynamic information related to the display of said Web page following the description in said HTML division and outputs the HTML output to said Web server division***”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have combined the teachings of Siow and Hill providing the benefit of a custom designed web page that matched the specific needs of a given display device.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

James H. Blackwell
02/22/04



SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER